

Utah Storm Water Advisory Committee - MINUTES Revised 3/11/10 per USWAC approval  
Feb 10, 2010 10:30am Cannon Health Building Room 114 Minutes

- Welcome and Introductions
- Approval of Minutes for Jan 13, 2010:
- Motion - Dan Woodbury, second: Paul Taylor with one correction which is that SL County Survey sample size is 500 not 5000
- Coalition Updates
  - Salt Lake - Dan Drumiler: RSI postponed – probably march for 30-40 people; water fair planning scheduled May 13-14 at Hogle Zoo
  - Davis – Ashley Thoman: Water Fair Apr 19-20; process for issuing citations; SOP process
  - Weber - Wayne Crowther: Water Fair April 27-28 probably; started inviting contractors and vendors
  - Cache: contractors meeting upcoming 2<sup>nd</sup> week of march; RSI training on 15-16 Mar;
  - Utah - Juan Garrido: training about regulations for contractors, developers, and others on Feb24, will promote RSI
  - Washington - Jeremy Spangler in St George and Ross in Washington City: coordinating with UDOT; looking into monitoring; continuing municipal trainings; working on drying beds – tied to sewer; booth at transportation expo (856 people came); looking into SOPs Items
- Sub-Committee Updates
  - RSI Program
    - RSI program: Steve Johnson has list of those RSIs, representing first 3 classes held
    - LTAPs representatives present at meeting, and gave information that some applications needed to be changed; LTAP always needs information from individuals to help decide whether they've passed (instructors asked to make sure application is complete); results should be faster from now on – within 2 weeks. A December class needed to send in more information, but now has done so
    - Discussion on tracking classes - the committee will meet today and will decide how to do it.
    - Web Site- seeing if someone can get trainer certification list, trainings, and presentations on web site.
  - Common Plan of Development – Mike Herkimer
    - Sub-committee needs to meet (next week). Concept is to shorten SWPPP IF a SWPPP has been prepared for a Common Plan of Development.
    - Harry Campbell explained that some things must happen: General permit must change; and if shortened SWPPPs reference “parent” SWPPP, there must be a record. Perhaps MS4s could keep track of it. Only the original copy would need to be on file (not most recent copy). Mike Herkimer clarified that the “big” Common Plan of Development SWPPP contains the information that does not normally change, and the smaller SWPPPs would contain the information that changes. Some details need to be decided.
    - George Burbidge concerned about SWPPP being a changing document. Paul Taylor explained that some information is historical or does not change. Trace Robinson said that it could be a Notice of Termination requirement for main development. Dan Woodbury said that their city does not keep SWPPPs. Rhonda Thiele said that it is a requirement of the MS4 permit. Harry Campbell explained that Nov 16, 1992 is when developments 5 ac or later needed SWPPP, as that is when Common Plan of Development became defined.
  - SWPPP Template: Dan Woodbury
    - Sub-committee meeting at Sandy City Hall at 1:00 next Tuesday.
    - Email reminder will be sent out.

- Ph 2 MS4 permit update
  - 27 comments were received including 5 from consultants and 1 from EPA.
  - Explanation that this is a renewal permit, and some of the dates are a further extension of the already extended permit.
  - Currently formalizing a written response to the questions. It appears that the permit will need to go through another public notice period.
  - EPA gave State some guidance just before public notice period, which is now privileged for States, which can now give comments to EPA. Some highlights are:
    - this is a more descriptive permit; there are performance standards.
    - specific numbers for inspections and other duties
    - all language of MEP is to be removed from permit; it will cross reference to Const general permit
    - infrequent analytical monitoring for pollutants of concern
    - some of requirements are hard to put into a general permit like the concept that a one acre threshold for construction may be too high, depending on the community, according to EPA;
    - EPA wants bi-weekly inspections for larger sites, and others inspected monthly
    - EPA is working to make new requirements for LID
    - EPA wants a tiered approach for maintenance, prioritized through assessing and sampling, also done through various MS4 activities; high priority areas will need very frequent inspections and site evaluations along with visual monitoring
    - The document from EPA will be shared as soon as it can be.
  - A response to public notice permit comments is expected in about 4 to 6 weeks.
  - No help in funding is expected, but funds analysis is helpful in showing why you are not or cannot do something.
  - Some discussion proceeded about new mandates with no funding, and comments from cities on federal regulations that are coming out may go a long way.
    - 74FR68617 is the rule in question
    - Curtis sent around a document in November, and a listening was held last week. We have about 2 weeks to get a comment submitted to EPA  
[epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/rulemaking](http://epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/rulemaking)
- EPA Federal General Construction Permit: Harry Campbell on how that permit would affect us: Effluent limitation guideline, non-numeric and numeric limitations that will affect construction general permit.
  - Non numeric effluent limitations: EPA is referencing Volume of storm water related to construction and post-construction, as opposed to flow rate. Objectives are in reaching pre-development hydrology. Therefore you need to look at retention and infiltration.
    - The injection wells issue stems from division of drinking water - well head protection.
    - A retention basin would be a substitute for infiltration.
    - Some issues would not change, like equipment washing, erosion and sediment control, and waste.
    - De-watering is also addressed.
    - Concrete washout is a prohibited discharge, in a stronger language.
    - Some Erosion and Sediment Control things that were options, will no longer be options, like minimizing disturbed slopes.
    - Basins will need to be designed for particulate size and 4 or 5 other design parameters that will need to be addressed, probably by an engineer (no design storm)
    - The manner of discharge is also an issue (from surface is preferred).
    - Maintaining natural buffers and topsoil are included, and passive treatment system is expected.
    - Harry Campbell expects that we'll start seeing the use of coagulants and polymers.

- This all will affect municipalities in that they will need to review the new requirements. State will need to come up with a definition for soil stabilization. Deadline was Feb 1, 2010.
  - Numeric Limitations: 280 ntu (daily average max), which is a visual measurement for opacity of water
    - better than suspended solids because of how it zero's in on the problem of clay particles in the water.
    - It can be done in the field with a turbidity meter.
    - The state will decide how the requirement will be applied, including whether lab or field measurements will be acceptable.
    - 280 ntu is total (not above background).
    - This will apply to disturbances within a common plan that are 10 ac or larger. The deadlines are Aug 2, 2010 for disturbances that are 20 ac. or greater and Feb 2, 2014 for disturbances that are 10 ac. or greater.
    - This will Notice of Termination apply if storm event is greater than 2yr 24 hour event.
    - Does apply to small lots that are part of a common plan that falls within the requirements
    - Overland sheet flow does not apply.
  - State has to apply any effective Effluent Limit Guidelines if they modify their permit.
  - Some clarification made by Harry Campbell and Mike Herkimer about mimicking pre-development runoff conditions.
- National APWA conference in Texas on storm water management workshop. Forms are available at meeting today by Steve Johnson
  - Revised State Inspection Form, explained by Dan Woodbury:
    - A proposed form was passed out. All information for record is on the first page, and second page is for particular inspection, including follow-up inspections. The 3<sup>rd</sup> page is for further follow-up and comments.
    - The information is the same, but has been re-arranged.
    - Harry Campbell mentioned that inspectors should place check marks on relevant SEV codes, which is very helpful for the state. All of the information is on the form that the state needs to submit to EPA.
    - Comments should be given ASAP to Dan Woodbury and Mike Herkimer.
    - MS4s are asked to use the current inspection form, but it is not necessary for contractors doing self-inspections.
    - Mike Herkimer said that you've got to get your comments in by end of month, by next meeting, a final form will be adopted.

Next meeting March 10<sup>th</sup> in the DEQ building.